

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A9a

19 DEC 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Inspector General's Survey of OTR

1. After reviewing those portions of the Inspector General's report of the Office of Training, we were pleased at the relatively few critical comments of the Registrar Staff contained in the report. We do feel, however, that much of note was omitted and in certain instances there are errors in describing certain activities carried on by the Staff.

2. The following are the Staff's responses to the recommendations contained in the report:

a) Recommendation #7 -- Concur for the reasons mentioned in paragraph 5 assuming adequate or thorough screening of nominees is provided within career services and at the Deputy Director level.

b) Concur

25X1A

Recommendation #8 -- Concur -- By regulation [REDACTED] standards for including training in the Agency Training Record was to show participation in and satisfactory completion of all Agency-sponsored training except on-the-job training approved by the Director of Training. The purpose of maintaining the official ATR was for career management and other purposes. In order to do this it was necessary to go beyond the standards and based upon experience and what seemed desirable to make the ATR an effective management tool, the standards were broadly interpreted to include

other than satisfactory completion of training expenditures of

money and/or workload. We have been well aware that changing

DOB	3	REV DATE	4 Apr 68	BY	02561U
ORIG COMP	11	UP	11	TYPE	02
ORIG CLASS	11	PAGES	4	CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	AUTH	10-2

ORIGINAL CL BY	061662
DECL BY	REV ON 2010
EXT BY	ND 0 YRS BY
REASON	04 (3)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/08/02 : CIA-RDP78-03921A000100020003-2

concepts and technology have required a new look at what was included in the Record. For this reason we took the first step by reducing the Record to the training taken during the past seven years. It now remains for us to adapt the Record to the new applications in management and the management sciences. We agree that certain required courses for new clerical employees not be included -- these include Clerical Induction and Clerical Orientation; this would exclude the Security Reindoctrination.

We also believe that courses of less than one scheduled day should not be included. In contrast we believe the internal two-week specialized active duty training for reservists be included.

Recommendation # (page 55) -- Concur - A series of meetings of representatives of the Registrar Staff and the Language School has produced a set of procedures to effect transfer of administrative functions as recommended. Elements of reporting may have to reside in the Language School until implementation of procedures is achieved.

Part II - Recommendation #4: It appears desirable that there be within the Office of Training a central point where inter-school problems, such as scheduling, deletion of duplication, etc., be be considered and reconciled.

Recommendation #5: Even if relieved of its responsibilities for reviewing nominations for the Midcareer Executive Development

Approved For Release 2001/08/02 : CIA-RDP78-03921A000100020003-2

CONFIDENTIAL

constitute a considerable drain on the time and energies of its very senior members. We, therefore, suggest that a working committee, representing all Directorates, be constituted under the direction of the Training Selection Board, thus making use of the Board's prestige.

3. The following appear as errors of interpretation by the Inspection Team:

a. Paragraph 3 - Page 23: It should be noted that the Training Selection Board is a function of the Office of the Director of Training who chairs this Board and not a function of the Registrar Staff; the Registrar Staff provides the Executive Secretariat for the Board.

b. Paragraph 7 - Page 25: Although it is likely that combining the four separate courses into a single course might reduce the workload, such a system could very well generate new problems not presently discernible. The fact that these four separate courses cut across three separate schools highlights to a degree what another kind of workload in our support of individual instructors would be.

c. Paragraph 11 - Page 27: The figure of \$700,000 per year being spent on external training is an estimate only.

Additions:

Recommendation #4 - This is a weasel-worded recommendation and I believe it's meaningless. If the IG really believed in this

CONFIDENTIAL

rather than "instruct DTR to consider the appointment." From the comment of paragraph 25-28, it appears that there is a wide-spread feeling among instructors that there is a need for a forum of a sort where ideas on training can be discussed. The OTR Senior Staff is presently doing this in staff meetings when School and Staff objectives are discussed. Some such weekly sessions for all instructors might prove valuable, particularly if the session were chaired by the DTR or DDTR, and would permit the discussion of mutual training problems. If such sessions were held, much of the stated need for a coordinator of instructors would be negated.

Recommendation #5: I find the interplay of "Course" objectives and "training" objectives in the discussion leading up to this recommendation makes difficult interpretation of the recommendation. Course objectives are the responsibility of OTR, training objectives the responsibility of the user of training. I believe each Directorate should have a mechanism for determining what they expect to achieve through training. OTR is well aware of its responsibilities for realistic and well developed "Course" objectives, and is taking steps to revise these in light of its "new look." I believe (possibly of Senior Training Officers) that a working group or committee monitored by TSB could be valuable in ensuring appropriate "training" objectives.

CONFIDENTIAL